

## UNITED STATE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Pat int and Trad mark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

HA

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR			ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/337,675	06/22/9	9 JAIN		R	029318/0497
		HM12/092!			EXAMINER
FOLEY & LARDNER 3000 K STREET, SUITE 500				FULLIAM. A	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON	DC 20007-	07-5109		1615 DATE MAILED:	18
				OAIE MAILLO.	09/25/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/337,675	JAIN ET AL.					
, arreery , reason.	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Amy E Pulliam	1615					
Th MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover she t with the o	correspond nc address					
THE REPLY FILED 12 September 2001 FAILS TO PLA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application of the supplication of the su	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in					
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three movement patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in					
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	•						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note to		,					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	terially reducing or simplifying the					
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment					
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT place the					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.							
	For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-22 and 25-36</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.							
☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)							
D. ☐ Other:							

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's arguments are not found to be persuasive. Applicant argues that Liversidge does not teach a controlled release formatulation. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated in the final rejection, Liversidge teaches the nanoparticulates claimed by applicant and their use in creating a solid dosage form. Furthermore, Liversidge teaches the use of polymers, which are known in the art to be rate controlling polymers, and it is the position of the examiner that their presence in the solid dosage form would provide controlled release properties.

THURMAN A PAGE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600